DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 170 987 EC 114 808

AUTHOR Breiter, Joan
TITLE Survey: Teachers of Gifted Elementary Students.
SPONS AGENCY Iowa State Univ. of Science and Technology, Ames. Research Inst. for Studies in Education.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 46p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Exceptional Child Research; *Gifted; *Instructional Materials; *Learning Activities; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teaching Skills; Values

ABSTRACT

The difference between theoretical value and actual classroom use by 32 teachers of gifted (GT) elementary students of materials, activities, and evaluation forms considered suitable for gifted children was investigated. Seventeen present or former GT teachers rated the survey items on a theoretical basis. Fifteen teachers presently working in GT programs rated them on the level of their actual classroom use. A significant difference in the mean ratings of items between theoretical value and actual use was found for a number of items. The materials used in GT programs most often appeared to be those used most often with children in general. A gap in ratings between theoretical values and actual classroom use was consistently found for materials, activities, and evaluation devices. Participants also responded to items regarding their teaching strengths, weaknesses, competencies, and needs, as well as the types of assistance desired from state and local education agencies. The survey concluded with questions on topics felt to be important in GT teacher education. (Author/CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED170987

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Survey: Teachers of Gifted Elementary Students

Dr. Joan Breiter

Funded by:
Graduate College, ISU
Research Institute for Studies in Education, ISU
Department of Elementary Education, ISU

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Joan Breiter

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC114801

Abstract

This study investigated the difference between the theoretical value and actual classroom use by teachers of gifted elementary children of materials, activities, and evaluation forms considered suitable for gifted children. The thirty-two participants were GT teachers, now or in the near past.

Seventeen present or former GT teachers rated the survey items on a theoretical value basis. Fifteen teachers presently working in GT programs rated them on the level of their actual classroom use. A significant difference in the mean ratings of items between theoretical value and actual use was found for a number of items.

Participants also responded to items regarding their teaching strengths, weaknesses, competencies, and needs, as well as indicating the types of assistance desired from various State and Local educational agencies.

The final section of the survey explored possible topics these teachers felt were important to include in course work designed to train teachers to work with gifted elementary children.

Theoretical versus actual importance of selected strategies and materials for use with gifted children as rated by practicing teachers of gifted children

Introduction/Purposes

This pilot study was conducted for two main purposes. First, to determine what strategies and materials were being used by teachers working with gifted children. Second, to determine if there is a significant difference between the theoretical importance rating teachers of gifted children assign to selected strategies and materials, and the actual level of use they make of these strategies and materials.

In addition to these major purposes, related purposes of this study included:

1. identification of areas in which teachers of gifted children could profit from inservice training,

2. clarification of the roles various educational agencies should play in GT education, as seen by the practicing teacher,

3. identification of the program types favored by practicing GT teachers, and

4. identification of teacher competencies these teachers view as important for success in working with gifted children.

An outgrowth of this pilot study will be the revision and further development of the GT program for graduate students offered by the Department of Elementary Education under the auspices of the Department of Professional Studies, Iowa State University.

Population/instrument/procedure

This study was conducted through a questionnaire[1] which was completed by teachers presently working in a program for gifted elementary children, who were preparing to work in such a program, or who worked in such a program recently. The GT consultants in each Area Education Agency in Iowa was asked to submit names of teachers who would fit one of the above categories, and the researcher contacted other GT teachers who were formerly enrolled in El. Ed. 521x, Teaching Strategies for Gifted Children.

Approximately 50 GT teachers were asked to participate in this study. Thirty-two agreed to do so, completed the research instrument, and returned it to the author. This phase of this study was conducted between October 1, 1978 and January 31, 1979.

The sample population was divided into two subgroups. Group 1 received Form A of the instrument. This form asked participants to rate strategies and materials suggested by authorities in the field as being appropriate for use with gifted children as to their theoretical importance to the participant. Whether or not the participant actually used the individual strategy or material was not a matter of concern for this rating. The rating scale used was a 4-point scale ranging from "highly effective" to "of little or no effectiveness." Seventeen participants used Form A.

Group 2 received Form B of the instrument. This form asked teachers to rate the same strategies and materials listed in Form A, but to rate

[1]See Appendix for condensed form of instrument, i.e. Forms A and B plus general section included in both forms.

them according to rhe individual particpant's actual classroom implementation of each item. The four-point scale used with this form ranged from "frequently used" to "seldom or never used." All participants in Group 2 are presently working in programs for gifted elementary children. Fifteen participants completed Form B.

All participants were also asked to supply general categorical information about themselves, and to respond to the following areas by written comments.

1. the type of program organization they preferred
2. the overall level of satisfaction with their competencies as GT teachers and the situation in which they worked
3. the types of help they felt most needed and most appropriate by various educational agencies.
4. the areas on which the University could best center their educational offerings for GT courses.

The instrument(s) used in this study was developed during the spring and summer of 1978 by the researcher. It was revised from its initial form on the basis of suggestions by university colleagues and AEA consultants to whom it was submitted for critiquing. The ISU Human Subjects Review committee, to whom it was also submitted, approved the provisions for the protection of individual participants built into the instruments.

The analysis of data was conducted during February and March, 1979 under the auspices of the ISU Test and Evaluation Service and with the advice of its director, Dr. Jack Menne. Initial analysis consisted of a numerical count by item, calculation of such common measurements as

means, and SDs, which were used as appropriate for the purposes of the study. T-tests on the means of the two groups for each item were also computed to determine on which items the difference in ratings between theoretical importance and actual classroom use was significant at the .05 level.

Report: Part I

Findings Form A: Theoretical Importance of Selected Strategies and Materials for GT Children and Form B: Actual Classroom Implementation of Selected Strategies and Materials for GT Children

Results

As seen in Tables 1-4, the thirty-two participants in the pilot study were mostly female, relatively experienced teachers, and quite new to working in programs for gifted children.

Table 1. Sex of Participants

Sex	Number
Male	1
Female	30
No answer	1
Total =	32

Table 2. Age of Participants

Age Category	Number
25-30 yrs. of age	9
31-40 yrs. of age	10
41-50 yrs. of age	8
51-55 yrs. of age	4
No answer	1
Total =	32

Table 3. Overall Teaching Experience

No. of Years	Number
1-5	4
6-10	13
11-20	20
21-30	4
No answer	1
Total =	32

Table 4. Teaching Experience with GT Children

No. of Years	Number
1	5
2	10
3	6
4	1
5-10	2
Over 10	2
No answer	6
Total =	32

In addition, these participants worked at a wide variety of grade levels. Table 5 indicates the grade levels at which their programs were operated.

Table 5. Grade Levels of GT Programs of Participants

Levels	Number of Participants
Gr. K-1	4
Gr. 2-3	0
Gr. 4-6	9
4-Jr. High (or Middle School)	2
K-6	6
1-6	3
K-12	2
3-6	1
K-5	1
No answer	4
Total =	32

Participants represented the length and breadth of Iowa, coming from eighteen different counties.[2] Both large and smaller school districts were represented by these participants.

[2]A list of counties in which participants worked may be found in the Appendix.

The following sections of this report will discuss the ratings given the items in the three areas of the instrument related to strategies and materials. The ratings of theoretical importance (Form A by Group 1) versus the ratings of actual classroom use (Form B by Group 2) will be explored for each area.

Area 1. Effective materials for use with gifted children

Table 6 lists the items rated by the participants, either as to theoretical importance or actual classroom use. In general, it can be noted that items rated high or low theoretically, were also rated high or low in actual classroom use. However, when looking at actual classroom use, even the most highly rated items were usually rated considerably lower than when they were being considered on a theoretical basis.

Of the materials listed, it would appear that resource people are the most highly rated and used "material" both theoretically and in actuality. Various types of games, models, films and filmstrips--and, probably, library/trade books--also appear both theoretically and actually often and effectively used.

Other materials suggested and highly rated by one or more people in either or both of the subgroups of participants included Great Books discussion groups, culture kits, tapes and records, field trips, Wise Owl publications, and various technical materials.

If one would set a mean rating of between 1 and 2 as an indication of high theoretical or actual value for these items, it would appear their theoretical value to be uniformly higher than their actual classroom use,

Table 6. Theoretical Importance Versus Actual Classroom Use of Selected Classroom Material

Classroom Material	Mean Rating* Form A	Number Rating Item	Mean Rating** Form B	Number Rating[X] Item	t-score	Mean Difference A & B Ratings
1. educational games	2.00	17	2.67	15	-2.23	-0.67
2. simulation games	1.18	17	2.67	15	-6.47	-1.49
3. cartoons	2.29	17	3.07	15	-2.88	-0.78
4. models	1.94	17	2.54	13	-1.83	-0.60
5. library/commercial books	1.65	17	--[+]	0	--	--
6. commercial kits such as ESS, SRA, etc.	2.35	17	2.93	15	-1.49	-0.58
7. worksheets	3.24	17	3.27	15	-0.11	-0.03
8. unit study guides	2.47	17	2.93	15	-1.59	-0.46
9. paper and pencil tests	3.00	17	3.60	15	-2.30	-0.60
10. resource people	1.00	17	1.73	15	-3.04	-0.73
11. posters	2.56	16	3.07	15	-1.94	-0.51
12. films and film strips	1.88	17	2.68	15	-3.20	-0.80
13. other (specify) see text for description of other suggested materials.						

*Theoretical importance scale: 1=highly effective, 2=effective, 3=somewhat effective, 4=of little or no effectiveness.

**Actual classroom use scale: 1=frequently used, 2=used, 3=occasionally used, 4=seldom or never used.

+Item inadvertently omitted from Form B. Researcher error.

0t-score not computed due to small number of participants who made a suggestion and rated it.

Xt-score computed on the differences between the mean ratings of the two groups. With df of 30, a t-score of ± 2.04 was necessary for the difference to be significant at the .05 level.

and the variety of items often used in the classroom to be relatively small in number. When using the t-statistic with this data (see Table 6), it appears the items whose mean ratings, relative to theoretical value versus actual use, are significantly different are numbers 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, and 12. Why the difference between the mean ratings from Group 1 to Group 2 is significant is open to exploration.

Area 2. Effective activities for use with gifted children

The relative ratings, theoretical and actual use, of activities appear to follow the same general trend as that of materials. Theoretical importance is rated higher than actual classroom use would suggest. However, the gap between the two is less than that seen for classroom materials in most cases; and the number of items rated between 1.00 and 2.00 suggests that, on a frequency basis, the teachers are using a greater variety of activities than of materials.

Other activities suggested and rated by one or more participants (#15) include interest centers, group studies, "magic circle" activities, and questionnaires.

Items for which a significant difference between theoretical mean ratings and actual classroom use mean ratings accurred were numbers 2, 4, 9, and 14.

Area 3. Appropriate evaluation devices for use with and by gifted children

A number of standard forms of evaluation were presented for the participants' consideration (see Table 8). Six of the nine given were ranked between effective and highly effective, theoretically; practically

Table 7. Theoretical Importance Versus Actual Classroom Use of Selected Types of Activities

Activities	Mean Rating* Form A	Number Rating Item	Mean Rating** Form B	Number Rating Item	t-score	Mean Difference A & B Ratings
1. role playing	1.71	17	1.93	15	-0.73	-0.22
2. sociodrama	1.82	17	2.67	15	-8.50	-0.85
3. field experiences	1.24	17	1.67	15	-1.43	-0.43
4. case studies	1.88	16	2.92	13	-3.46	-1.04
5. discussions	1.29	17	1.40	15	-0.50	-0.11
6. checklists	2.63	16	3.00	15	-1.29	-0.37
7. questionnaires	2.50	16	2.60	15	-1.28	-0.10
8. observational activities	1.88	17	2.21	14	-1.14	-0.33
9. text study	2.53	17	3.29	14	-2.57	-0.76
10. independent reading	1.41	17	1.93	15	-1.54	-0.52
11. exercises for critical thinking	1.06	17	1.60	15	-1.80	-0.54
12. exercises for problem solving	1.06	17	1.53	15	-1.62	-0.47
13. exercises for creativity	1.06	17	1.33	15	-0.99	-0.27
14. independent study projects	1.06	16	1.80	15	-2.28	-0.74
15. other (specify) _____						

*Theoretical importance rating.

**Actual classroom use rating.

Table 8. Evaluation Devices for Use With and By Gifted Children

Device	Mean Rating Form A	Number Rating Item	Mean Rating Form B	Number Rating Item	t-score	Mean Difference A & B Ratings
1. paper and pencil tests	3.00	17	3.47	15	-1.46	-0.47
2. oral reports	1.53	17	2.40	15	-2.94	-0.87
3. written reports	1.88	17	2.73	15	-2.50	-0.85
4. demonstrations	1.00	17	1.60	15	-2.80	-0.60
5. student-teacher conferences	1.18	17	1.73	15	-1.89	-0.55
6. teacher observation	1.59	17	1.40	15	-0.61	0.14
7. skills tests (on specific item(s))	2.41	17	2.93	14	-1.76	-0.52
8. achievement tests (general)	2.59	17	2.71	14	-0.43	-0.12
9. discussion	1.31	16	1.36	14	-0.25	-0.05
10. other (please specify)	1.00	2	1.60	5		
_____	--	--	2.00	2		
_____						

11

speaking, however, only four of these were actually used often by classroom teachers. Demonstrations, conferences, teacher observation, and discussion--all nonwriting in nature--were favored over other types of evaluation.

Write-in suggestions and ratings for additional evaluation forms included student models (products), peer evaluation devices, self-concept and moral development inventories, self-evaluation devices, questionnaires, oral testing, and the use of games and booklets.

There appeared to be a gap in mean ratings between the theoretical and actual use of evaluation devices/forms just as in materials and activities. This difference did not seem to be as extreme as for the other areas. Those items a t-test indicated were significant at the .05 level were 2, 3, and 4.

Area 4. Type of Program Organization Preferred

A type of program in which GT children had classroom time with a special teacher during a specific part of each school week was the organization form most preferred by the participants, as seen in Table 9. Table 10 shows the types of programs represented by this sample population.

A number of participants listed program types other than those given in Table 9 as preferred organizational types. These suggestions included the following formats.

1. a combination mentor and weekly seminar
2. a summer program on a weekly basis
3. a resource room

Table 9. Preferences in GT Program Organization

Ranking	Form A Participant*			Form B Participant*			Combination		
	# 1	# 2	# 3	# 1	# 2	# 3	# 1	# 2	# 3
1. a program during school hours in which children spent part of the day with a special teacher, and part in the regular classroom.	14	1	1	9	2	0	23	3	0
2. a separate classroom with pupils from several grade levels.	0	3	2	0	3	1	0	6	3
3. a separate classroom for each grade level of gifted child.	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	3
4. mainstreaming - all programming in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher.	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	2
5. a Saturday program.	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
6. an after-school program.	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	3
7. a mentor program within school hours.	0	13	1	2	4	4	2	17	5
8. a mentor program outside of school hours.	0	0	8	0	1	4	0	1	12
9. other (please specify) _____	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	2	2

_____

_____

*Not all participants ranked these items.

Table 10. Types of Programs in Which Participants Work

Program Type	Number of Participants in Type of Program
a program during school hours in which children spent part of the day with a special teacher, and part in the regular classroom.	11
a separate classroom for each grade level of gifted child.	1
mainstreaming - all programming in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher.	5
a mentor program within school hours.	1
a mentor program outside of school hours.	3

4. a combination of mentor, in-school pull-out, and use of resource room
5. a combination of regular and special teachers and an outside mentor
6. a combination of rotating teachers and mentor
7. cluster grouping
8. mainstreaming with opportunity for special groups
9. an alternative school, and
10. a mentor program operating both in and outside of school hours.

Conclusions

The materials used in programs for gifted children most often appear to be those used most often with children in general. Very few of them are rated in the effective to highly effective range by practicing GT teachers. More are theoretically rated highly than are actually used. This fact brings up a question which needs to be answered. Is

the difference in rating due to actual gap between theoretical and classroom value, to the limitations in the teacher's skills, or to a combination of these and, perhaps, other unknown factors?

The gap in ratings between theoretical values and actual classroom use is consistently found whether one is looking at materials, activities, or evaluation devices. The same question--stated above--would seem to apply to all these areas.

Recommendations

1. An effort should be made to determine the reason for the apparent gap between theoretical and classroom value of the materials, activities, and evaluation forms explored in this study.

2. A larger sample, drawn from several areas of the country, is desirable as a check on these findings.

3. The instrument should be revised to include an opportunity for participants to indicate the reason they rate certain items low as to classroom use.

Report: Part II

Findings

Part II of the questionnaire focused on teachers' response to a series of questions about themselves and the situations in which they work. All participants (Form A and Form B) were asked the same questions, and no separation of answers from Form A and Form B participants was made.

Question one asked teachers to state what each considered his or her greatest strength(s) as a GT teacher. Thirty different answers resulted. However, in categorizing these answers into broader areas, those strengths most often mentioned were: flexibility, creativity, empathy, enthusiasm, ability to build rapport with students, teachers, administrators, and community, deep interest and commitment to gifted children and their education, good health and stamina, and security of self. The Appendix contains a list of all items listed by respondents.

Conversely, in Question two all participants were asked to list what they considered to be their greatest weakness(es) as a GT teacher. Nineteen different responses were given. When combined into broader categories, the majority of them seemed to fall under the following headings: lack of formal training, lack of time to both plan and teach, gaps in subject matter knowledge, involvement of other teachers, parents, and the general community to develop a positive attitude toward GT programs, finding new ideas and materials to make the learning experiences truly qualitatively different. The Appendix contains the complete list of responses given to this question.

Question three focused on the adequacy of resources GT teachers had for working with their students. A few teachers felt they were well-supplied with a variety of appropriate resources, but the majority listed one or more resources they felt were lacking. Most often mentioned were: mentors, space, materials, and funds. A list of all "resource lacks" felt by study participants may be found in the Appendix.

Both in talking with teachers at such events as meetings or conventions, and in conducting this study, an area of real concern, and some degree of frustration to them, has been the community. When asked what type of community involvement/support would be most helpful to them, the overwhelming single response involved the participation of community members in the program as mentors or as citizens who supported that concept. Very closely related to this were pleas for general community awareness, involvement, and moral support in a positive way. Again, the Appendix can be consulted by the reader for a complete list of responses to Question four. Several teachers did indicate the existence of fine parental, school board, and administrative support for their GT program.

Question five moved from community support/involvement to that of school administration support/involvement. Again, several teachers reiterated their notation of fine support by their administration. The majority of teachers listed at least one area in which they felt the school administration could be more supportive of GT education. Most often mentioned in this area were: financial support for substitute teachers, materials, and a full-time GT teacher, more planning time, active administrative involvement in other than a directive role, a

supportive liaison role between GT and other teachers, and district-wide inservice in GT education. Other responses may be found in the Appendix.

The final question in this part of the survey requested GT teachers to list the professional competencies they felt a teacher should have to work with gifted children. Over 50 different, but often related, responses were given. Respondents appeared to interpret competencies and personal characteristics as synonymous in many cases. The following itmes are those identified as important by at least five respondents.

1. enthusiasm
2. flexibility
3. self-security
4. creativity
5. ability to develop higher level thinking skills and creative thinking in students
6. ability to challenge/motivate students
7. have formal training for the position
8. have interests and abilities in many areas
9. possess good human relations skills
10. ability to accept, understand, and plan for each child realistically
11. have a strong subject matter background
12. have a clear understanding of one's own teaching/learning styles, and be able to use several
13. be familiar with available materials, activities, resources, and outlets
14. be knowledgeable concerning theories and techniques in guidance, questioning, curriculum, and authorities in the field.

The Appendix contains the complete listing of responses in a condensed version.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, GT teachers have a positive feeling about their programs and situations, but are realistic about shortcomings in the areas discussed. It is obvious that changes are needed for these programs to reach their full potential. Basic to changes involving financial support, materials, etc. is the understanding and whole-hearted support of the general faculty, administration, school board, and community.

It would appear that the task of educating all affected groups, and convincing them of the real value of GT programs, is incomplete at this time. Not only grass roots efforts, but State and Federal commitment must grow if the needs of GT children throughout the State are to be met.

Report: Part III

Findings

Part III of this survey asked participants to indicate the roles through which various educational agencies could be of most help to them as GT teachers. The identified agencies were: the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), Area Education Agencies (AEAs), Local Education Agencies (LEAs), organized parent groups such as TAG, and colleges and universities.

A wide variety of responses regarding the possible role of each of these agencies was received, but the majority of responses seemed to cluster about a few central points in each case. The discussion of these roles will focus on those central points.

Areas in which respondents felt the DPI could be most helpful were in:

1. disseminating information on programs, meetings, legislation, recent writings in the field,

2. demonstrating a strong commitment to GT education through lobbying for funds, assisting in writing funding requests, and general financial support,

3. providing materials and consultants to work as teams with school boards, to provide realistic inservice experiences, and to do on-site visitation and follow-up with school districts, and

4. providing specific guidelines and some type of quality control regarding program development.

The types of roles in which GT teachers would like to see AEAs operate strongly included:

1. provision of consultants to work with the school district on a regular basis on such things as workshops, program organization and implementation, program problem solution, specific and general inservice, and classroom visitation,

2. provision of all kinds of materials which can be borrowed by individual GT teachers for local classroom use.

The major helping roles participants would like to see their local education association play revolve around developing positive attitudes toward and knowledge of GT programs within the general faculty and administration of the district, supporting funding for such programs, and becoming involved as individual faculty members in auxiliary roles.

Similarly, GT teachers see parent groups as having a valuable role in promoting an understanding of GT children and their needs, providing both moral and more tangible support for programs, and in becoming involved in the program through mentor programs.

Participants also saw colleges and universities as having a definite helping role in various aspects of GT education. The roles most often suggested as most appropriate for this agency were: offering classes and programs in a variety of settings to train GT teachers, to involve themselves as resource people through consulting, making speeches, acting as mentors, providing inservice and field training, exerting quality control over new professionals in the field, and collecting resource materials and teaching ideas to share with inservice teachers.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, it would appear that GT teachers have definite opinions as to how various educational agencies should be able to assist them--and

Report: Part IV

Suggested Course Offerings as Rated by GT Teachers

Findings

Iowa State University now offers a Master's program in Elementary Education which can be used to build individualized programs to prepare teachers to work with GT children. The Department of Elementary Education offers courses, practicum experiences, and thesis (or non-thesis) experiences. It draws from a variety of other departments for courses in research education, psychology, child development, and subject matter specialization to complete each student's program in a way which best meets the individual's needs and situation.

Part IV of the survey asked participants to rate suggested areas for GT courses. The Department of Elementary Education is currently revising it's general course and implementing a second course. Direct expression of needs by practicing GT teachers would seem to be a valuable asset in course development at this time. Table 11 lists the areas teachers were asked to rate and the mean value of their ratings for each item.

As can be noted from Table 11, all of the items listed were felt by a majority of responding participants to be worthy of inclusion to some degree in the GT course work, with teaching strategies of both a general and a specific nature deemed most useful/important of all those listed.

A number of suggestions were given regarding other topics suitable for such courses. Among them were work in values clarification, morals development, group dynamics, "negative" leadership, goal setting, program evaluation, psychology of the gifted child, use of questioning techniques,

to have equally strong feelings that none of these agencies are providing enough appropriate assistance quickly enough to meet their felt needs. The majority of the roles GT teachers perceive as being appropriate for each agency are also being seen as appropriate by the agencies, themselves, but the level and quality of their involvement needs to be increased quickly and drastically.

Inherent in the participants' definition and "assignment" of helping roles to the various agencies is the plea for knowledgeable, specific, practical assistance, a positive attitude, and understanding of their needs followed by effective implementation of their areas of theoretical strength.

Table 11. Ratings of Potential Course Work Areas

	Areas	Mean Rating*
1.	identification and screening of children for a gifted program	1.31
2.	working with parents of gifted children	1.69
3.	working with the community	2.00
4.	working with the administration	2.23
5.	working with other teachers	1.77
6.	the underachieving gifted child	1.15
7.	the rural gifted child	1.67
8.	the culturally disabled gifted child	2.15
9.	the socially or economically disabled gifted child	1.85
10.	general teaching strategies to use with gifted children	1.69
11.	problem solving and critical thinking and creative thinking	1.00
12.	using learning devices (such as simulation games, programmed learning, calculators, computer terminals)	1.77

*1 = highly useful
2 = useful
3 = somewhat useful
4 = not needed/useful

developing a directory of mentors, information on how to set up a program, and discu[illegible] of problems a GT child might have in a classroom.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As we are planning to revamp our present course, and inaugurate a second course, the teacher ratings are of considerable help in determining broad content areas for both courses. It would seem appropriate to now determine what topics should be covered in each course, based on these findings. It is possible that different aspects of the same topics should be covered in each course in some cases.

The researcher will use this base line data to finalize GT course content with the assistance of authorities in the field this (1979) summer quarter. During July 9-13, 1979 she will attend an LTI Leadership Training Institute in Honolulu, Hawaii. The purpose of the Institute is to assist participants in the solution of specific problems in GT program development, curriculum, and related areas. The result of her participation should be the completion of this anticipated course development.

APPENDIX

Form A

Form B

County List

Comments and Listings: Form A and B

- Teacher Strengths
- Teacher Weaknesses
- Helpful Resources Needed
- Helpful Community Support/Involvement

Form A.

Survey Instrument for Teachers of Gifted Children: The Theoretical Importance of Selected Strategies and Materials for Use with Gifted Children

SURVEY: Teachers of Gifted Elementary Children: Importance Rating Form

Background: Education for gifted children is becoming increasingly important in Iowa. There is a great need for universities to be able to provide both classes and practical experiences which will help teachers of g/t children to do their job better, as well as to be aware of the part these teachers feel various state and local agencies can play in furthering appropriate education for these children and inservice for their teachers. This questionnaire is an attempt to obtain information which will help us do just that. Your frank responses will be much appreciated, and your anonymity will be preserved. No participant will be personnally identified or connected to any specific school system in the report of this study. Please feel free to add any other comments beyond those asked for if you wish. Thank you very much for giving the time and thought I realize it takes to complete this questionnaire.

Please return your completed survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Dr. Joan Breiter
Department of Elementary Education
201 Quad North
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa 50011

General directions: The following areas focus on materials and strategies which may have positive implications for effectively working with gifted children. They represent a composite of what is presented in the literature. Please rate each item under each area as to the importance you believe it has in regard to working with gifted children, whether or not you yourself actually use the material or strategy at the present time. Directions for recording your responses are given with each area.

Rating scale

A = Highly effective
B = Effective
C = Somewhat effective
D = Of little or no effectiveness

A special note to all participants: It is desirable that a general description, based on categorical data, of the sample population be given when the results of a study or pilot study are published. If you have no personal objection to supplying this type of information, please respond to the items below. Your responses will remain individually anonymous in any and all reports of this study.

Sex: Female_____ Male _____ Age in Years: _____
Total Number of Years of Teaching Experience_____
Number of Years of Teaching Experience in Programs for Gifted Children _____
Grade Level(s) of g/t Children with Whom you Work_____
Name of the County in Which you Teach _____

Area 1: Effective materials for use with gifted children.

Background: Some materials seem to have more usefulness than others in teaching various types of learning.

Directions: Please rate the following items as to how effective you believe they would be in working with gifted children in general, whether or not you actually use them yourslef.

Rating scale:

A = Highly effective
B = Effective
C = Somewhat effective
D = Of little or no effectiveness

1.	educational games	A	B	C	D
2.	simulation games	A	B	C	D
3.	cartoons	A	B	C	D
4.	models	A	B	C	D
5.	library/commercial books	A	B	C	D
6.	commercial kits such as ESS,SRA, etc.	A	B	C	D
7.	worksheets	A	B	C	D
8.	unit study guides	A	B	C	D
9.	paper and pencil tests	A	B	C	D
10.	resource people	A	B	C	D
11.	posters	A	B	C	D
12.	films and film strips	A	B	C	D
13.	other (specify)_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____				
	_____				

Area 2: Effective activities for use with gifted children.

Background: A variety of activity types is needed for an effective program, as well as for IEP's.

Directions: Rate each of the following activities as to how important you think each would be in providing an appropriate overall program for gifted children, whether or not you actually use all of them yourself.

1.	role playing	A	B	C	D
2.	sociodrama	A	B	C	D
3.	field experiences	A	B	C	D
4.	case studies	A	B	C	D
5.	discussions	A	B	C	D
6.	checklists	A	B	C	D
7.	questionnaires	A	B	C	D
8.	observational activities	A	B	C	D
9.	text study	A	B	C	D

10.	independent reading	A	B	C	D
11.	exercises for critical thinking	A	B	C	D
12.	exercises for problem solving	A	B	C	D
13.	exercises for creativity	A	B	C	D
14.	independent study projects	A	B	C	D
15.	other (specify) _____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D

Area 3: Appropriate evaluation devices for use with and by gifted children.

Background: Gifted children should be involved both in the planning and the evaluation of their work. Which of the following evaluation devices have you found appropriate in working with gifted children, assuming various forms of evaluation are appropriate at different times and in different circumstances.

Directions: Rate each of the listed evaluation devices listed below, using the ABCD scale, according to how important each theoretically is in working with gifted children, whether or not you actually use them all yourself.

1.	paper and pencil tests	A	B	C	D
2.	oral reports	A	B	C	D
3.	written reports	A	B	C	D
4.	demonstrations	A	B	C	D
5.	student-teacher conferences	A	B	C	D
6.	teacher observation	A	B	C	D
7.	skills tests (on specific item(s))	A	B	C	D
8.	achievement tests (general)	A	B	C	D
9.	discussion	A	B	C	D
10.	other (please specify)_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D

Form B

Survey Instrument for Teachers of Gifted Children: The Actual Importance as Identified by Classroom Implementation of Selected Strategies and Teaching Materials for Use with Gifted Children.

SURVEY: Teachers of Gifted Elementary Children: Use Rating Form

Background: Education for gifted children is becoming increasingly important in Iowa. There is a great need for universities to be able to provide both classes and practical experiences which will help teachers of g/t children to do their job better, as well as to be aware of the part these teachers feel various state and local agencies can play in furthering appropriate education for these children and inservice for their teachers. This questionnaire is an attempt to obtain information which will help us do just that. Your frank responses will be much appreciated, and your anonymity will be preserved. No participant will be personally identified or connected to any specific school system in the report of this study. Please feel free to add any other comments beyond those asked for if you wish. Thank you very much for giving the time and thought I realize it takes to complete this questionnaire.

Please return your completed survey in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Dr. Joan Breiter
Department of Elementary Education
201 Quad North
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011

General Directions: The following areas focus on materials and strategies which may have positive implications for effectively working with gifted children. Please rate each item under each area as to the importance they have to you as you work with gifted children, ie. - what degree of use you actually make of these materials/strategies insofar as they are available to you? Directions for recording each response are given with each area.

Rating Scale

A = frequently used
B = used
C = occasionally used
D = seldom or never used

A special note to all participants: It is desirable that a general description, based on categorical data, of the sample population be given when the results of a study or pilot study are published. If you have no personal objection to supplying this type of information, please respond to the items below. Your responses will remain individually anonymous in any and all reports of this study.

Sex: Female_____ Male _____ Age in Years: _____
Total Number of Years of Teaching Experience_____
Number of Years of Teaching Experience in Programs for Gifted Children _____
Grade Level(s) of g/t Children with Whom you Work _____
Name of the County in Which you Teach _____

Area 1: Effective materials for use with gifted children.

Background: Some materials seem to have more usefulness than offers in teaching various types of learning.

Directions: Please rate the following items as to how often you use them with gifted children with whom you work, recognizing that while each child has an individual learning style, certain types of resources are likely to appeal to gifted children, in general.

Rating scale:

A = frequently used
B = used
C = occasionally used
D = seldom or never used

1.	educational games	A	B	C	D
2.	simulation games	A	B	C	D
3.	cartoons	A	B	C	D
4.	models	A	B	C	D
6.	commercial kits such as ESS, SRA, etc.	A	B	C	D
7.	worksheets	A	B	C	D
8.	unit study guides	A	B	C	D
9.	paper and pencil tests	A	B	C	D
10.	resource people	A	B	C	D
11.	posters	A	B	C	D
12.	films and film strips	A	B	C	D
13.	other (specify) _____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____				

Area 2: Effective types of activities for use with gifted children.

Background: A variety of activity types is needed for an effective program as well as for IEP's.

Directions: Rate each of the following activities as to how often you use it in your work with gifted children.

1.	role playing	A	B	C	D
2.	sociodrama	A	B	C	D
3.	field experiences	A	B	C	D
4.	case studies	A	B	C	D
5.	discussions	A	B	C	D
6.	checklists	A	B	C	D
7.	questionnaires	A	B	C	D
8.	observational activities	A	B	C	D
9.	text study	A	B	C	D

10.	independent reading	A	B	C	D
11.	exercises for critical thinking	A	B	C	D
12.	exercises for problem solving	A	B	C	D
13.	exercises for creativity	A	B	C	D
14.	independent study projects	A	B	C	D
15.	other (specify) _____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D

Area 3: Appropriate Evaluation devices for use with and by gifted children.

Background: Gifted children should be involved both in the planning and the evaluation of their work. Which of the following evaluation devices have you found appropriate in working with gifted children, assuming various forms of evaluation are appropriate at different times and in different circumstances.

Directions: Rate each of the listed evaluation devices listed below, using the ABCD scale, according to how often you actually use each in your work with gifted children.

1.	paper and pencil tests	A	B	C	D
2.	oral reports	A	B	C	D
3.	written reports	A	B	C	D
4.	demonstrations	A	B	C	D
5.	student-teacher conferences	A	B	C	D
6.	teacher observation	A	B	C	D
7.	skills tests (on specific item(s))	A	B	C	D
8.	achievement tests (general)	A	B	C	D
9.	discussion	A	B	C	D
10.	other (please specify) _____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D
	_____	A	B	C	D

Area: Type of program organization for gifted children.

Background: Many basic formats and variations of basic formats are possible when building a program for gifted children. Most districts arrive at some variation of a basic program type based on their local needs and local resources. Overall, what general program organization do you think would be of most benefit to gifted children? Your answer may or may not reflect the program type in which you now work.

Directions: Several well-known general program types are listed below. Please rank them from 1-9 according to your personal choice, if you were able to choose any type or variations of program type for your school.

_____ a program during school hours in which children spent part of the day with a special teacher, and part in the regular classroom.

_____ a separate classroom with pupils from several grade levels.

_____ a separate classroom for each grade level of gifted child.

_____ mainstreaming - all programming in the regular classroom by the regular classroom teacher.

_____ a Saturday program.

_____ an after-school program.

_____ a mentor program within school hours.

_____ a mentor program outside of school hours.

_____ other please specify) _____

_____

_____

Question: Which of the formats listed above is closest to the one in which you teach?

_____

Please respond to the following questions. Use separate paper if you need additional space. Be as specific as you can in your comments. All responses will be held individually anonymous.

1. What do you consider to be your greatest strength(s) as a G/T teacher?

2. What do you consider to be your greatest weakness(es) as a G/T teacher?

3. Do you have adequate resources available for your use? If not, what specific type(s) of resources would be most helpful to you and your students?

4. What type of community involvement/support is or would be most helpful to you as a G/T teacher?

5. What type of involvement/support by your school administration is or would be most helpful to you as a G/T teacher?

6. Please list the professional competencies you feel a teacher should have to work well with gifted children. Feel free to include competencies you wish you had as well as those you do have. List as many as you can that you feel to be important and useful.

HELP! HELP!

Various agencies around the State are available to provide help in program organization, screening/identification, teaching strategies, etc. for gifted children and teachers of the gifted. Each agency has specific areas of strength/expertise through which they could appropriately offer assistance when it is requested. Sometimes their areas of strength overlap to some degree. Please answer the following items to indicate how you feel each of these agencies could best be of help to you as a G/T teacher.

A. Department of Public Instruction (DPI):

B. Area Education Agencies (AEA):

C. Local Education Agencies (LEA):

D. Parents Groups (such as TAG):

E. Colleges & Universities:

Iowa State University's Department of Elementary Education presently offers one graduate level survey courses for teachers of gifted children. It is planning to offer both an advanced course and practicum experience. A variety of areas which could be included for indepth study in an advanced course is listed below. Please rate them according to the personal need for feel such a course could help to meet, using the ABCD scale.

_____ identification and screening of children for a gifted program
_____ working with parents of gifted children
_____ working with the community
_____ working with the administration
_____ working with other teachers
_____ the underachieving gifted child
_____ the rural gifted child
_____ the culturally disabled gifted child
_____ the socially or economically disabled gifted child
_____ general teaching strategies to use with gifted children
_____ problem solving and critical thinking and creative thinking
_____ using learning devices (such as simulation games, programmed learning, calculators, computer terminals)
_____ others _____
_____
_____

Counties Represented in Study

Black Hawk	Grundy
Bremer	Mahaska
Buchanan	Polk
Buena Vista	Pottawattamie
Carroll	Scott
Clayton	Story
Dallas	Tama
Decatur	Wapello
Dubuque	
Greene	

Question 1 - Strengths	No. Answers
flexibility	8
adaptability	
empathy	4
creativity	9
interest in learning	3
ability to listen	2
ability to accept and understand child	3
enthusiasm	6
secure in self	3
ability to encourage child	
rapport with kids (and adults)	4
interest in areas kids like	
ability to motivate	3
willingness to seek further training	
ability to promote GT case to various groups (inc. staff)	3
warmth and responsiveness	2
understanding of gifted child	3
wide teaching experience	3
ability to let students carry the ball	
interest in helping kids achieve their potential (expectations)	4
know about lots of things	3
humor	
ability to use different methods to meet needs of child	2
commitment	
acceptance	
interest in working in a GT program	
ability to plan and organize program benefiting students	
patience	
intelligence	
intellectual curiosity	

Question 2 - Weaknesses	No. Answers
lack of formal training	5
lack of communicating efforts to regular staff	
not spending time to find enough mentors	
lack of (planning) time	8
wanting things to happen quickly	
lack of contact with other G/T teachers	
subject matter knowledge gaps	4
motivating the non-motivated	2
finding time to teach needed skills and encourage special projects	
desire to do too much of the planning, etc.	2
getting enough stimulating ideas and material	1
where and how to get materials and information	
making each lesson truly qualitatively different	
inability to change attitudes of other teachers about their TAG students	
don't keep enough records	
need to be more organized	4
working with and involving parents and/or community	2
new techniques	
not always providing enough direction	

Question 3 - Helpful resources needed	
mentors	7
time	3
cooperation from other teachers	
space for continued studies	6
funds	10
library for research work	2
full-time G/T teacher	
more materials	4
anthology of teaching methods for junior high age	
transportation	
more AEA consultant help	
opportunity for field trips	
guidance counseling	
office/space	
aide or resource person for teaching	
AV materials and equipment	
more personnel	
more opportunities and guidance for G/T to explore possibilities	

Question 4 - Helpful community support	No. answers
volunteer mentors and/or support for such	23
person to coordinate mentor program	2
parents planning with teacher	
positive communication	
support (moral support) and general involvement	2
financial support	
community awareness and positive AV	5
involvement of colleges	
support of business community	

Question 5 - Helpful administration involvement/support	
teacher freedom to choose project areas	
financial support	5
- for substitute teachers	
- for materials	
allowing proof of success other than scores	
give planning time	5
give time to attend teachers meetings/workshops etc.	2
consultant help	
backing the GT teacher	4
hire full-time GT teacher	
supplement salary of regular teacher working part-time with gifted	
be involved in all phases of program (but not chairman)	5
district-wide program for continuity (large district/ variety of programs)	
district inservice in ongoing way	4
changing attitude of classroom teachers	
become knowledgeable of GT	2
better identification	
classroom organization	
format change	
support from other teachers	2
space	
allowing curriculum change as evaluation is completed	

Question 6 - Professional competencies considered desirable	
enthusiasm	7
empathy	
flexibility	7
adaptability	
good listener	2
ability to motivate	
self-secure	7
creativity	11
able to develop higher level thinking skills and creative thinking	6
ability to get students to aim higher/challenge them (motivate)	5
belief in needs of GT children (commitment)	2

Question 6 (Continued)	No. answers
formal training - adjunct to personal qualities	8
perception	
affection	
above-average intelligence	5
socially aware	
interest and abilities in many areas	6
acceptance and encouragement of divergent thinking	3
ability to plan for the individual	2
sense of humor	4
good human relations (public relations)	4
teaching role - facilitator	3
freedom in thinking	
positive attitude in general	4
professional attitude regarding problems in program building	2
attending meetings etc.	
rapport with students	
ability to accept each child as is/understand them/ plan for them	10
warmth	
organization	
personal motivation	3
patience	2
understanding	
subject matter background	9
research skills (for teacher and to teach to children)	4
understand own teaching/learning styles and able to use several	5
familiar with material/activity/resources/outlets available	9
skills in human relations	3
wide teaching experience	
knowledge of how to keep records (funded projects)	
ability to get community involved	
knowledge of guidance techniques	2
knowledge of questioning techniques	
knowledge of curriculum in general	2
knowledge of theories of authorities in field	4
ability to write a workable GT program	2
like kids	
rapid reader	
great stamina	
skill in group processes	
read in area	
ability to be wrong and admit it	
ability to work with parents	
not necessary gifted oneself	
ability to provide supportive atmosphere	2
work toward less government red tape	
good physical and mental health	
ability to work with other teachers	
have had a field practicum with G/T students	2